

Tells the Fact and Names the Names

\$2.50

CounterPunch

JUNE 16-30, 1999

Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

VOL. 6, NO. 12

■ IN THIS ISSUE

THE WARS AT HOME

- Abner Louima Isn't the Only Haitian Cops Have Nearly Killed: Meet Max Antoine
- Guess How Congress Fights White Suburban Student Killers? It Passes Laws Aimed at Inner City Kids

THE WARS ABROAD

- Van Heusen Attacks Its Guatemalan Workers
- Can Small Countries Defend Themselves Against Assaults By Bombers?
- Prince Charles Fights On Against Monsanto

PLUS

- The Skeletons In Hillary's Closet

BILL TO BORIS:

"Clinton phoned me late last night. Just fancy! It turns out that I am a good chap. I am a diplomat, and lots of other nice things. A veritable Jack-of-All-Trades."

Boris Yeltsin, June 11, 1999

Labor Stumbles

There were cheers and brave talk almost four years ago, as new leaders took over the AFL-CIO. Yet this spring has marked an awful defeat for the very campaign intended to symbolize labor's resurgence: the United Farm Workers' campaign to organize the strawberry workers in Watsonville on California's central coast. There were serious miscalculations right from the start. They are but part of the reason why a militant labor movement can't come out of Washington. Here's a short history.

Fall 1995: John Sweeney is elected AFL-CIO chief. "Organizing" is his campaign mantra, mimicked in the last-ditch days before the election even by his opponent, Lane Kirkland's crusty lieutenant.

Spring 1996: AFL HQ sponsors a series of organizing conferences in cities throughout the country. The theme is "The Right to Organize", and then-organizing director Richard Bensinger declares that this will be the next great civil rights movement, a fight for organized and unorganized workers alike; not just a union thing, but a class thing.

Spring 1997: The United Farm Workers decides to take on the strawberry growers in California, and the AFL makes that drive its number-one organizing priority, flooding Watsonville, California, with money and people. Steve Lerner heads the federation's campaign. His wife, Marilyn Schneiderman, heads the AFL's department of field mobilization. All other organizing activity on the West Coast is put on the back burner to build for the kick-off demonstration in Watsonville; 30,000 people participate in the march. Local activists worry that because of its long absence from the fields the UFW may have miscalculated in picking the strawberry workers for their fight and that, because their only informant is the UFW, the AFL

people, who might easily be attacked as "outsiders", won't know the difference until it's too late. [See Frank Bardacke's report in CounterPunch at the start of the campaign.]

Fall 1997: "Organizing" and "Union Cities" are the big themes of the AFL-CIO convention. Some 400,000 workers joined unions in the previous year but because of shutdowns, downsizing, electoral challenges, decertification, etc., the total number of unionized workers in America still dropped. Union Cities, the project to energize local labor councils, is represented at the convention by four labor councils that were hot even before Sweeney took over the helm. Bensinger "confides" to journalists that out of more than 100 councils signed on to the program, these four and maybe one or two others are the only ones where things are really shaking.

Winter 1997/1998: As a thank-you for the AFL's tremendous effort on the party's behalf in 1996 and a form of down payment for 1998, Democratic leaders (viz. Al Gore) help broker a deal whereby Monsanto will sell Gargiulo, the world's biggest strawberry grower, to investors who promise to be neutral toward unionization efforts. The company is renamed Coastal Berry. The UFW changes course: instead of trying to organize the whole industry based on winning some immediate concessions in the fields, it will turn all its attention to Coastal Berry and gear up for a representation election.

Spring 1998: In Avondale, Louisiana, site of the AFL-CIO's other high-priority Right to Organize effort—a campaign to force Avondale Shipyards to accept the decision of the workers to unionize, a decision supported by the National Labor Relations Board in the biggest case in its his-

(Labor continued on page 8)

Our Little Secrets

THE WAR ON TEENS

After six bouts of school-boy mayhem in twenty months, Congress is in the throes of proposing or passing a flurry of measures that would have done nothing to stop such mayhem, and will do everything to turn the screws tighter on inner-city youth already in trouble with the law. In the second week of June the talk was all of gun control, pop-culture control and the Ten Commandments, as the House fought over how much to concede to the gun lobby and how much to mollify the crucial "suburban voters".

Along with posting of the 10 Commandments in schools, only the gun measures made the headlines. The Senate passed these on May 20 under the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act of 1999 (popularly called the juvenile crime-control act), which authorizes \$1 billion mostly for law enforcement and the attendant increase in judges, lawyers, prisons, police, probation officers, record-keepers and the like, with several millions thrown in as percs for the helping professions. Senator Charles Schumer, father of the three-strikes-you're-out/'midnight basket-

ball" Crime Bill in his previous incarnation as a member of the House, said the key was fashioning gun amendments that could be seen as bearing some relationship to what had happened in Littleton, Colorado. In Littleton, Dylan Klebold and Eric Harris did get two shotguns and a rifle from a gun show, purchased for them by Klebold's prom date, Robyn Anderson, who is 18, has no police record and thought "it was just in their personality trait" to want guns.

Clearly, Anderson would have sailed through a background check whether the waiting period was three days, as passed in the Senate, or twenty-four hours, as currently being argued about in the House. But even without her help there were other means for acquiring guns by two kids cunning enough to build thirty bombs without anyone noticing. In every other high-profile school shooting—Springfield, Oregon; Pearl, Mississippi; Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; and Conyers, Georgia—the boys didn't buy their guns, which were mostly found right at home. They were all underage, anyway, (11 to 17) and except for Mitchell Johnson of Jonesboro, who had been prosecuted in juvenile court for fondling a tyke when he was 12 (such criminal proceeding being the only response to one child's violation of another), they did not have court records. Harris and Klebold had tangled with the law, but they were A students, one of them drove a BMW; the police said they had a bright future.

Not one of these kids was poor or belonged to a street gang, but the juvenile crime-control act has whole sections devoted to "Juvenile Gangs", "High Intensity Interstate Gang Activity Areas", "Gang-Free Schools and Communities", "Community-Based Gang Intervention". In different ways it makes countless references to "the coordinated investigation, disruption, apprehension, and prosecution of criminal activities of gangs and gang members". It repeatedly connects "at-risk youth" with juveniles who live in poor neighborhoods, with high rates of crime and drug activity, and families in need of strengthening; never with juveniles who are called fags or dorks, whose schools are controlled by bullying jocks, who write

frequently about guns and killing and plan on joining the military just like Dad, who are dumped by their girlfriends on top of being fags or dorks or just like Dad. It increases penalties three to five times from what they currently are for using minors to distribute drugs, and two to three times for using minors to commit acts of violence or to help from getting caught.

Mostly, though, "juvenile crime control" insures that juveniles 14 or older who commit certain crimes will be tried as adults. And, for all practical purposes, under the bill's provisions a kid is presumed an adult unless proven juvenile. Central to such proof is the absence of a police record, and again for these purposes, a juvenile police record is treated as if it were an adult record. Since three out of four young black males are somehow involved with the criminal justice system, overwhelmingly on petty drug charges, and since it's typical for petty drug dealers to be involved in the business before they turn 18, it's plain on whose head all this is going to come down most heavily.

BRAVE NEW WORD

Here is a short essay we like by Diana Johnstone on the perverse language of NATO's warriors.

A number of people are saying that what NATO has been doing shouldn't be called "war". The word "war" suggests nations fighting each other. In this case, a group of the richest and best-armed nations on earth, led by the greatest military power in history, have ganged up to beat the hell out of one small, surrounded country which never harmed any of them and couldn't possibly defend itself. Day after day, the great powers destroy the little country's factories, bridges, power stations, leaving men, women and children, old and young, infirm or healthy, without light or running water. Then the bombers start in on residential areas and hospitals. Bit by bit, destroying a whole country. If the victim offers to give in, the big powers bomb some more, reiterating that "all they understand is force".

Insult is added to injury. Cartoonists and pundits invent a fictional version of the target country to hold up to public scorn, ridicule and hatred. Political leaders, spotlighted spokesmen and highly paid opinion-makers escalate the verbal abuse, comparing the population of the

Editors

ALEXANDER COCKBURN
JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

Co-writer

ANDREW COCKBURN

Design

DEBORAH THOMAS

Counselor

BEN SONNENBERG

Published twice monthly except
August, 22 issues a year:

\$40 individuals,
\$100 institutions,
\$30 student/low-income

CounterPunch.

All rights reserved.

CounterPunch welcomes all tips.

CounterPunch

3220 N. St., NW, Suite 346

Washington, DC, 20007

1-800-840-3683 (phone)

1-800-967-3620 (fax)

www.counterpunch.org

victim country to Nazis and suggesting that they must be conquered, punished, occupied and taught how to behave by the superior civilized governments that are bombing them. The bombs even destroy the victim country's means of communication with the outside world, so that neither their pain nor their wounds, neither their tears nor their courage are visible or audible to their torturers.

Is this war, or is this torture? Here's a suggestion for a word to designate this abject use of military might: "warture". The word has one disadvantage. It wouldn't be easy to translate into other languages. But in the brave new NATO world order of warture, no other language than English is really needed.

THE 11TH COMMANDMENT

"Anyone who is not a strong supporter of Israel should not be allowed to serve any state in the union, let alone the Empire State." Thus spake Gov. George Pataki of New York at the centennial dinner of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, as quoted in Forward, June 11, 1999. The same edition of Forward imparts the news that Jerry Springer has been given Man of the Year award by the national Jewish fraternity Tar Epsilon Phi. The qualifying factor, according to George Hasenberg, is that Springer "has upheld Jewish values".

SWEAT MARKS

Philip Klatsky is the CEO of Philips-Van Heusen, the NY-based clothing company. Klatsky is a long-time friend of the Clintons and big wig at Democratic Party gatherings. In 1998, Klatsky was named by Clinton to a spot on the Apparel Industry Partnership, the White House's sweatshop reform panel, which CounterPunch exposed as a sham group last year. Klatsky also serves on the board of Human Rights Watch, where he rubs shoulders with Sid Sheinberg, Bianca Jagger, Anita Roddick and Toni Morrison.

Van Heusen has been on a roll since Klatsky took over the helm in 1985. Typically, however, the company's profits have come at the price of good paying jobs. Van Heusen used to operate 21 factories in the United States. Now it is down to one. To avoid paying US labor costs, Van Heusen began opening maquiladora plants in Latin America ten years ago. But Klatsky felt that even the company's low-wage Latin American plants were cutting into its profit

No, it's not OK to buy a Van Heusen shirt!

margins too deeply. In December 1998, Van Heusen announced that it was shutting down its Camisas Modernas plant in Guatemala City, throwing 500 laborers out of work. The Camisas plant was the only unionized factory in Guatemala. Klatsky claimed the company was forced to shut down the dress shirt factory because of a need to scale back production due to lagging demand.

But a new report by three workers' rights groups indicates that Klatsky's excuse was bogus. Using data from the company's own filings with the SEC, the report shows that Van Heusen's dress shirt demand was growing. The real reason Klatsky shut down the Camisas factory was to crush the union and further reduce its labor costs by farming out the work to sweatshop labor. One former worker at the Camisas factory got a job at the new contract sweatshop and said that her wages were cut by 70 percent. Meanwhile, Van Heusens' orders for dress shirts from its non-union contractors in Latin America increased dramatically, jumping 500 percent at one Guatemalan factory.

The report was prepared by the US/Labor Education in the Americas Project, United Students Against Sweatshops and the People of Faith Network. The reports authors asked Human Rights Watch to investigate Van Heusen's abusive labor practices. The group, on whose board Klatsky sits, replied that they found no evidence that Van Heusen had violated workers' freedom of association.

THE PRINCE FOR PREZ!

Prince Charles has once again launched an attack on genetically modified foods and their prime maker and marketer, Monsanto. In late May, the Prince of Wales posted ten questions about the "Frankenstein" foods on his website, causing the Blair government, a tireless advocate of Monsanto, to protest that the Prince was straying once again into political issues. But the British public is staunchly behind the Prince and Blair was once again rebuffed in his demand that Charles remove his anti-Monsanto postings from his webpage. Here are the Prince's ten questions about genetically modified foods:

1. Do we need GM food in this country? The Prince: The benefits, such as there are, seem to be limited to the people who

own the technology and the people who farm on an industrialised scale.

2. Is GM food safe for us to eat? The Prince: Only independent research, over a long period, can provide the answer.

3. Why are the final rules for approving GM foods so much less stringent than those for new medicines produced using the same technology? The Prince: Before drugs are released on to the market they have to undergo the most rigorous testing...Surely it is equally important that [GM foods] will do us no harm.

4. How much do we really know about the environmental consequences of GM crops? The Prince: Lab tests showing that pollen from GM maize in the United States caused damage to the caterpillars of Monarch butterflies provide the latest cause for concern. More alarmingly, this GM maize is not under test.

5. Is it sensible to plant test crops without strict regulations in place? The Prince: Such crops are being planted in this country now - under a voluntary code of practice. But English Nature has argued that enforceable regulations should be in place first.

6. How will consumers be able to exercise genuine choice? The Prince: Labeling schemes clearly have a role to play, but if conventional and organic crops are contaminated by GM crops, people who wish to avoid GM food products will be denied choice.

7. If something goes wrong with a GM crop, who will be held responsible? The Prince: It is important that we know precisely who is going to be legally liable to pay for any damage.

8. Are GM crops really the only way to feed the world's growing population? The Prince: This argument sounds suspiciously like emotional blackmail to me.

9. What effect will GM crops have on the people of world's poorest countries? The Prince: Where people are starving, lack of food is rarely the underlying cause. The need is to create sustainable livelihoods for everyone.

10. What sort of world do we want to live in? The Prince: Are we going to allow the industrialisation of Life itself, redesigning the natural world for the sake of convenience? Or should we be adopting a gentler, more considered approach, seeking always to work with the grain of nature?" ■

Those Skeletons in Her Closet

How Vulnerable Is Hillary?

If Hillary Clinton truly enters the race against Rudy Giuliani, and the word we hear from the White House is that she definitely plans to, it will be the first time she'll be standing square in the sights as a candidate, and forced to respond directly to all charges flung at her along the campaign trail. It's true that she's been the target of investigation before, but the venues of combat have been depositions, a grand jury session and one appearance before Congress to justify her health program, where the legislators treated her with ermine gloves.

So what are her immediate vulnerabilities, after seven years of close scrutiny? Remember, 80 to 90 percent of the Whitewater scandal had HRC's fingerprints all over it. She was the corporate lawyer who finagled the lucrative land swaps and mortgage scams that had Seth Ward, Webb Hubbell's father-in-law, acting as a money channel.

It was the billing records from that phase of the Clinton's property operations that first went missing and finally came to light in HRC's private quarters. By her own admission, HRC was handling all the Whitewater financial work for the Clintons.

HRC's riposte to onslaughts by Giuliani on such matters will no doubt be that she and Bill have emerged unscathed from the most ferocious scrutiny in American investigative history, by Ken Starr and his team. But Starr never did issue a report on Whitewater, and HRC narrowly escaped indictment for perjury committed in the course of her grand jury deposition testimony. Hickman Ewing was handling this aspect of Whitewater for the Starr probe. He found that HRC was safe under the statute of limitations for what she did back in the Whitewater era, but was open to a perjury rap.

In the end Starr didn't have the nerve, but HRC may not be quite out of these particular woods yet. HRC's erstwhile partner at the Rose Law Firm, Webb Hubbell, has now had Starr's charges restored against him by a federal appeals court, and faces trial on the matter of whether he was bribed to silence when he

got highly lucrative consultancy fees after he'd left the Justice Dept. and, in some cases, after he'd been indicted.

This Hubbell trial is set to start in August of this year, and HRC will obviously be a prime focus of the prosecutor and the press. Hubbell is looking at some serious prison time if he goes down and might have some incentive to sing.

As a corporate lawyer HRC has plenty of unwholesome skeletons rattling in the closet, quite aside from Whitewater. The Rose law firm is not a charitable institution. Its work in the sale of the Beverly nursing home chain is perhaps something that Giuliani's researchers will take a passing interest in, since the sale did leave a number of old folk facing higher fees and all the discomforts attendant on being kicked out in the snow.

Then there was the LaFarge cement and incineration business on whose board HRC sat. Any third-party Green candidate might take an interest in the conduct of this enterprise. And as HRC tries to muster the support of New York's labor unions, Giuliani will perhaps evoke her years on the Wal-Mart board, a company not noted for its admiration for the proud tradition of Gompers and Debs.

There's the matter of HRC's inexplicable enrichment, to use a phrase that Mexican prosecutors hung around the neck of Raul Salinas. Salinas has had to explain how he got more than \$120 million from Mexico to a Swiss bank. In HRC's case the sum was piddling by comparison, a tad under \$100,000. But it was the manner in which, under the kindly guidance of Jim Blair, chief corporate counsel for Tyson Foods, and also of the futures magician "Red" Bone, Hillary's modest investment of \$1000 in cattle futures bloated up to the \$100,000 level that HRC has always had some difficulty in explaining.

More unsettled business comes in the form of Travelgate, another chapter in the Starr investigation. Starr did say nothing impeachable had come out of his

Travelgate probe, so far as Bill Clinton was concerned. But Bill was a peripheral figure in that affair. HRC was at the heart of Travelgate. David Watkins, a deputy White House counsel ultimately forced to resign for over-ebullient use of White House helicopters, did make notes—now in possession of the Starr team—recording that it was HRC who wanted Billy Dale and his staff "out now".

Suppose HRC accuses Giuliani of violating civil rights and of having about his person the aroma of the police state. Now imagine the righteous prosecutorial finger of Rudy Giuliani pointing straight back at HRC, reminding her and the voters of New York of Filegate. Once again, HRC seems to have been the person who brought on board Craig Livingstone, former barroom bouncer, to head up White House security and amass several hundred files on enemies of the Clintons, possibly including Rudy Giuliani himself. Will HRC defend the cruel erosions of civil liberties accomplished on her husband's watch? What will she say about her husband's Effective Death Penalty Act?

HRC will defend herself from all charges of scandal by deploring these souvenirs of Ken Starr's long and costly effort to beat down Bill Clinton. She will insist that Giuliani concentrate on substance. But her own record on substance isn't so hot. Her supervision of health reform back in 1994 ended in debacle. And although she will doubtless be offering herself as a friend of the poor and down-trodden, evoking her work as board member of Marian Wright Edelman's Children's Defense Fund, the dismantling of the welfare system occurring on the Clintons' watch is perhaps not a substantial achievement she will want to boast about. After all, Peter Edelman, Marian's husband, did resign from Health and Human Services in protest.

HRC has taken a principled stand...on Palestinian rights, and Giuliani has already lost no time in reminding voters of this.

The Hubble trial is set to start in August and HRC will obviously be a prime focus of the prosecutor and the press.

Beaten and Paralyzed by Cops, Cut Off Medicaid, Ignored by the Press

Max Antoine: New Jersey's Louima

Is there a rationing policy by the press that we are allowed only one atrocity against a Haitian per decade? While the recent guilty plea of Justin Volpe in the Abner Louima torture trial generated some headlines, an equally brutal incident in Irvington, NJ, has passed by virtually without attention. This case involves a gang of cops who forced their way without probable cause into an apartment where a party was going on, hurled racist language, beat up several guests and nearly killed one of them, after he asked for their badge numbers. It also involves complicit emergency medical teams who refused treatment to the battered victims, a prosecutor's office that chose to go after the victims rather than the cops and an utterly indifferent press. In other words, a typical day on the streets in black America.

On June 2, 1996, Marie D. Antoine, a Haitian immigrant, was hosting a family birthday party at her apartment in Irvington. Apparently, one of the neighbors called Irvington police to complain about the noise. At 2 a.m., three Irvington police officers, Phillip Rucker, Alfredo Aleman and Keith Stouch arrived at the apartment and asked that the music volume be lowered. The stereo was turned off.

But 15 minutes later the police returned and forced their way inside. The officers entered without a warrant and without the consent of Marie Antoine.

When they came through the door, one of the officers allegedly yelled, "Get the fuck out, the party's over!" The officers searched the apartment, apparently for drugs, with flashlights. Frustrated that the guests did not immediately begin to leave, the police began pushing and shoving people out the door. At this point, Marie Antoine's brother Max, a paralegal who ran an accounting service, told the guests (most of whom were Haitians) that they had the right to be there and that in America the police weren't permitted to "act like the Ton Ton Macoutes." He asked his sister, Marie, to write down the officers' badge numbers so that he could file an official complaint.

Officer Rucker apparently overheard Max Antoine's comments. According to

numerous witnesses at the apartment, Rucker pushed his way through the crowd, knocking to the ground Marie (who was six months pregnant at the time), and grabbed Antoine by the neck. Rucker allegedly rammed Antoine's head into the wall. Then, guests say, Antoine was hit in the head by a nightstick swung "in a baseball-like fashion" by Officer Aleman.

Antoine dropped to the floor in agony. Now all three cops were on top of him, and witnesses say that Officer Stouch stomped on him while the other officers flailed away at his head and body with their nightsticks. Several of the guests tried to intervene, but they were shoved aside.

Meanwhile, the three cops dragged Max out of the apartment and into the hall, where he was kicked and beaten again. Marie Antoine tried to stop the abuse, asking, "What are you doing to my brother?" According to Marie, Officer Rucker turned to her and said, "I will teach him about

According to Marie, Officer Rucker turned to her and said, "I will teach him about American law".

American law." Max was then handcuffed and dragged down a flight of stairs, screaming in pain, as his five year-old daughter, Nelchael, watched in horror.

At the bottom of the stairs, witnesses report, the police picked Antoine off the floor and shoved him through the doorway, pushing his head through the glass pane on the storm door. Max was then placed in the back of the police cruiser and sprayed in the face with a burning chemical, most likely pepper spray.

By this time, 10 more police officers arrived on the scene. As in the Rodney King beating, none of them attempted to stop the attacks on Antoine. Instead, they cordoned off the area and sent all the guests inside the apartment.

Max Antoine's ordeal was far from over. When he reached the police station, he repeatedly asked for medical treatment. Instead, he was led across the lockup area and, still handcuffed, thrown into a cell and beaten and kicked again. Antoine says that when he asked to use the phone to call for an attorney, one of the officers snapped,

"Shut up and die like a man."

Despite the fact that he was bleeding profusely, police didn't call the emergency medical team until after Max Antoine had been booked. When the medics arrived, they refused to give him any medical attention. Antoine, whose injuries were numerous, excruciatingly painful and life-threatening, spent two nights in jail before he was released to his family.

Antoine was taken to St. Barnabas Hospital, where he was placed in intensive care. His injuries were serious and debilitating. He sustained a fractured left eye socket, a broken jaw, bowel and bladder damage and spinal injuries. Over the next few months, he underwent 17 surgeries, including lumbar and spinal implants.

The beating left Max Antoine permanently disabled. He is now paralyzed below the waist and blind in his left eye. He has suffered brain damage and has lost sexual function. According to his wife,

Max is often depressed and suicidal. His medical bills are piling up and he has no way to pay them off.

Antoine and several of the guests at his sister's party lodged complaints with the Irvington Police Dept. and the prosecutor's office. Ultimately, a grand jury was convened. But the prosecutors never called any witnesses and no charges or other disciplinary action was taken against the police officers.

The Antoines also sought the help of the Clinton administration. However, the Justice Dept. has so far refused to investigate the case.

Antoine, however, has been charged with resisting arrest and assaulting a police officer. He is slated to go to trial on July 26.

Antoine and his family have filed a civil suit against the Irvington police and the emergency medical service, saying his civil rights were violated and that he received inadequate medical care. Certainly, he has suffered awful ordeals because of (Antoine continued on page 7)

Will Bombing Always Be Risk Free For the Bombers?

First Iraq, Now Serbia

Despite almost three months of sustained bombing, the Serbian military appear to have been relatively unaffected by the air assault. Serb units withdrawing from Kosovo offered little confirmation of the triumphant bombast spewed forth daily by Pentagon spokesmen and Jamie Shea, the Dr Goebbels of Brussels. Well shaved and fed, in clean uniforms, they had plenty of fuel, and moved with ease along a supposedly shattered road and bridge network. Hardly the demeanor of an army battered into submission by high assaults.

This is not to deny that the bombing campaign was disastrous for the Serbian economy. Nato, conscious that the vaunted precision systems are little of use against a well dug in military, devoted the bulk of its attention to civilian targets, notably electrical power systems and the Danube bridges. While Milosevic would probably have been able to continue his defiance of Nato under these attacks, the fatal blow for him was the loss of Russian support.

Such realities will have little effect on official postwar analyses. Instead, key "lessons" of the war are being eagerly retailed by the press, the most significant being that the European air forces could make only marginal contributions to the bombing campaign because they lacked precision guided bombing systems and that therefore they had better hurry up and buy some — from the U.S. of course — so that they too can lay waste irksome states at will.

On the face of it, once such delights as JDAMS precision guided bombs (the kind that took out the Chinese embassy) repose in their arsenals, the Europeans will be able to attack civilians without fear of casualties. Serbian air defenses, though they did succeed in forcing Nato to bomb from 15,000 feet and higher, managed to shoot down only two of the attacking planes in the entire war. Such ratios, according to friends of CounterPunch in the weapons design community, are unlikely to last for ever.

Ever since the 1950s, the air defense sector has whored after the false gods of radar guided missile systems. In essence, these rely on a ground based radar "illuminating" the target and then relaying in-

formation on its position to the missile. This was the basis of the Serb air defense network, equipped with Soviet designed SAMs. Radar guided missiles are unsatisfactory in many respects. Because they are necessarily emitting information—the radar signals—the ground based radars must inevitably advertise their precise location, thus rendering themselves liable to targeting and destruction by anti-radiation missiles, launched from planes, which simply home in on the source of the radar beam. Failing that, the signals can be jammed. (It is true that the Serbs did employ a certain amount of cunning in the deployment of their system, evading destruction by keeping the bulk of the radars switched off, thus forcing Nato to take account of the potential threat posed by these withheld assets and exercise commensu-

rate caution.) A further disadvantage of radar guided missiles lies in their lack of maneuverability. Ever since the Vietnam war, U.S. pilots have been aware that these missiles, especially large models designed for high altitude such as the SAM-2 and the mobile SAM-6, are easily evaded since they cannot follow a target in even a gentle turn.

Despite these proven drawbacks, the weapons-producing countries of the developed world (including the Russians) have shown little interest over the past few decades in pursuing imaginative concepts that can be effective against bomber attack. This is to the obvious detriment of developing countries who, since they are the designated targets, are the market for such weapons. Sooner or later someone will realise that there is a rich market waiting for anyone who

Words That Stand the Test of Time

Back in 1994, our friend Doug Lummis, who teaches in Tokyo, wrote a prophetic attack on the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. It appeared in *The Nation* for September 26 of that year. Pointing out the dubious legal standing of this body conjured into being by the UN Security Council, Doug reflected that the Hague-based Tribunal, not to be confused with the World Court, would most likely be "yet another instrument to bind new fetters on the poor, and give new powers to the rich."

Then Lummis goes on: "It is a scandal in contemporary international law, don't forget, that while wanton destruction of towns, cities and villages is a war crime of long standing, the bombing of cities from airplanes goes not only unpublished but virtually unaccused. Air bombardment is state terrorism, the terrorism of the rich. It has burned up and blasted apart more innocents in the past six decades than have all the antistate terrorists who ever lived. Something has benumbed our consciousness against this reality. In the United States we would not consider for the presidency a man who had once thrown a bomb into a crowded restaurant, but we are happy to elect a man who once dropped bombs from airplanes that destroyed not only restaurants but the buildings that contained them and the neighborhoods that surround them."

On this very topic, we should add that a Spanish pilot has charged that he and his fellow pilots were given targeting orders by US officers, requiring them to bomb civilian targets. In the Spanish periodical *Articulo 20*, Captain Adolfo Luis Martin de la Hoz is quoted as saying, on his return from the bombing war, that "Several times our colonel protested to NATO chiefs as to why they select targets which are not military in nature. They threw him out with curses, saying that we should know that the North Americans would lodge a complaint to the Spanish forces, both through Brussels and to the Defense Minister. But there is more and I want to disclose it to the world. Once there was a coded order from the North American military that we should drop anti-personnel bombs over Pristina and Nis. The colonel refused this altogether and a couple of days later the transfer order came." ■

finds a more effective defense against the bombers.

An entirely feasible alternative approach lies in the possibility of missiles with passive guidance systems. These rely on the target itself advertising its location, either by the heat emitted by its engines or the radio/radar signals it necessarily broadcasts in order to locate targets, communicate with other planes, or identify itself as a "friendly" to the rest of the attacking force. The U.S. Sidewinder missile, designed to be used in aerial combat, is a tremendously successful heat-seeking missile and has spawned a host of imitations. At one point the U.S. developed the Chaparral system, essentially a ground fired Sidewinder. This proved unsatisfactory as it was too small to carry the propulsive power to propel it to the height and speed of potential targets—a Sidewinder, after all, is launched from aircraft flying at high speed in the vicinity of the target. Ground based heat seeking missiles such as the shoulder fired Soviet SAM-7 or the famous Stinger are obviously too small to be of use against anything but low flying targets.

Should anyone with the necessary resources apply themselves to the task, it would be entirely possible to develop a ground launched passive guidance missile with a motor large enough to enable it to reach the target. High speed should not be an essential requirement, since any plane carrying bombs will necessarily be traveling at sub-sonic speed. Of greater importance would be a high degree of potential maneuverability gained through a large wing area on the missile. Ideally, such a missile would carry a dual guidance head, both radar seeking for bringing it to the area of the target and heat seek-

Sooner or later someone will realize that there is a rich market waiting for anyone who finds a more effective defense against the bombers.

ing for terminal guidance.

The simplest and oldest means of shooting down a plane are of course guns. Anti-aircraft gunfire is an exercise in prediction, since the target is moving at speed and will therefore have changed its position relative to the gun from the time the bullet is fired to when it arrives in the target area. Thus a hunter aiming at a speeding pheasant "leads" the bird, ie aims just in front of it. A target traveling in a straight line obviously makes the job of prediction easier. Once the target starts to maneuver away from a straight line, the potential for the bullet to miss obviously increases. Therefore the faster the bullet travels, the better chance it has of hitting the plane—more precisely, if the flight time of the bullet is halved, the miss distance will be cut by a factor of four.

The speed of a bullet is determined by both its aerodynamic properties and the explosive power of the charge that propels it. Little constructive work has been carried out in this area since World War II, and certainly not by the Soviet designers who created much of the weaponry presently deployed by developing countries. The best on offer is probably the 35 mm round developed by Oerlikon, the Swiss arms manufacturer, which is effective past 10,000 feet. Again, there is no inherent reason why high velocity rounds with higher altitude range could not be developed.

Lastly, it seems curious that a crucial

component of the Nato air offensive against Serbia was able to function unchallenged. The Global Positioning System, a network of 24 satellites orbiting 11,000 miles above the earth, enables anyone with a receiver to fix their position with great precision by triangulating their location with radio signals transmitted from two or more of the satellites. Nato bombers navigated by means of GPS; the Cruise missiles that rained down on Serbia were directed to their targets by GPS, as were the JDAMS bombs employed in the mysterious strike on the Chinese.

It should be a simple matter to jam the GPS radio signals. Indeed a 1994 Rand Corporation study conducted on behalf of the U.S. Air Force, with distribution restricted to the military and defense contractors, concluded that "an extremely low jamming power of one watt will cause loss of code tracking" and therefore "clearly the use of GPS for military applications is extremely vulnerable..." Those engaged in the attacks on civilian and diplomatic targets should be thankful that the defenders did not have recourse to this simple expedient. Future attackers may not enjoy the same immunity. ■

(Antoine continued from page 5)

the police beating. For example, he had a neurotransmitter inserted in his spine to stimulate his paralyzed muscles. This device must be replaced every two years. He also needs continuing rehabilitation therapy. These requirements and the initial operations have yielded a medical bill thus far of \$650,000. Medicaid has enabled Antoine to take care of this bill, but now he faces the consequences of Bill Clinton's deal with the Republicans on Medicaid "reform," which set a ceiling—which has now kicked in—of \$1500 per year. So he faces the likelihood that he won't be able to replace the neurotransmitter, or even go to therapy. Such a journey requires the hiring of a van able

to take a person in a wheelchair. Rental rates for these vehicles are high. Antoine's wife, says that he uses up the \$1500 in a month.

For their part, the Irvington police claim that it's all Antoine's fault and that he incurred his injuries while being taken from the apartment complex. If we are to believe the cops, Antoine—handcuffed at the time—suddenly broke free and threw himself through a glass storm door and then refused medical treatment for two days.

What happened to Antoine is even worse than the assault on Abner Louima, yet the indifference of the Justice Dept. and of the New Jersey police to this outrage has been total. ■

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, \$40
One year institution, \$100
One year student/low income, \$25
Please send back issue(s)

(\$3/issue)

"I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions"

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Payment must accompany order.
Add \$10 for foreign subscriptions.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Return to: **CounterPunch.**
3220 N Street, NW, Suite 346
Washington, DC 20007

tory—grinds on with no foreseeable end. In New Orleans, the ongoing federation-sponsored campaign to organize workers in the tourist industry is high on rhetoric and vim, low on well-focused, disciplined, strategic organizing.

Spring 1998: Richard Bensinger, whose tenure as organizing director was marked by helpful cheerleading, distracted hops from one project to the next, emphasis on recruiting college students with no real experience as workers into the AFL's Organizing Institute, and schmoozing with the press, is fired. He is replaced by Kirk Adams, a diligent bureaucrat with little substantive organizing experience.

Winter 1998/1999: Despite the AFL's overwhelmingly successful efforts to defeat Republicans in the 1998 election, the Clinton administration does nothing to force the Navy's fourth largest contractor, Avondale Shipyards—a company that could not survive without Pentagon contracts—to abide by the expressed will of its workers and the rulings of the NLRB.

June 4, 1999: Strawberry workers at Coastal Berry vote 688 to 598 in favor of a company union called the Coastal Berry of California Farm Workers Committee. It is a staggering defeat for the UFW and the AFL. The Committee's vice president, Sergio Leal, tells journalist David Bacon that Coastal Berry is "a great company...the people have no complaints. We're not going to change anything". The defeat of the UFW represents a many tentacled strategy by the Western Growers Association against unionization efforts, involving harassment, intimidation,

firings, cooptation, financial backing of the Committee by growers and indifference to impropriety by the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board toward those improprieties. But it also represents the failure of deal-making at the top. The neutrality agreement at Coastal Berry was paid lip service at the highest corporate level, but lower down the ladder, the company did nothing to disturb its network of anti-union foremen, whose control over the pickers' labor gives them direct power to threaten workers. Because the union had identified Coastal Berry as a good company by dint of its neutrality agreement, it never mounted the all-out campaign against the bosses that might have got the workers' blood up. Then, too, growers and foremen alike were able to exploit Chicano/Mexican tensions between UFW organizers and strawberry workers, and outsider/insider tensions between AFL organizers and the local people. Finally, because the union abandoned its industry-wide strategy to focus on Coastal Berry, its future in the strawberry fields is murky to say the least. The AFL spent \$12 million on the campaign. In the absence of building an organization of and by the workers, the federation would have been better off just distributing \$20,000 to each of the 600 strawberry workers who gave the union their votes.

June 19-25: The AFL-CIO's week of action on organizing takes place, with hearings, rallies, demonstrations and other public actions in cities across the country. The project originally commenced under the title Right to Organize, with its straightforward reference to the civil right

most consistently ignored and legally flouted in this country. Late in the game, AFL HQ announced a new name for the week-long project—Voice @ Work: Freedom to Choose a Union. The name change, brainchild of AFL communications director and longtime Washington pr exec Denise Mitchell, came as a result of the labor bureaucracy's favorite pastime: poll-taking and focus-grouping. Local activists and leaders (and even some HQ staff) complain that "Freedom to Choose a Union," with its evocation of individualism and its retreat from the basic principle of rights, is defensive in nature and not too far a throw from the slogan of labor's most vicious opponents, "Right to Work".

Four years into the Sweeney regime, the AFL's organizing department continues to be filled with people who are not organizers fundamentally and who have never been able to draw up a clear, bold, focused strategy and stick with it. The department of field mobilization is staff-heavy and seems dedicated mostly to self-promotion and arrogant, bureaucratic one-upmanship. Meanwhile, local unions and labor councils struggle along, most of them with little money and less staff, to make something happen at the roots. They have victories that no one reports and that get little support from Washington because they don't reflect glory on the HQ staff. (The silver lining: they also don't get red-baited or otherwise attacked.) The hope for movement rests only with them—and with the links they can make with close-to-the-ground fighters beyond organized labor—just as it always has. ■

CounterPunch
3220 N Street, NW, Suite 346
Washington, DC 20007

Presorted
 First Class Mail
 U.S. Postage
 PAID
 Permit No. 269
 Skokie, IL

First Class Mail

Attention Subscribers: the number that appears above your name on the mailing label refers to the ISSUE NUMBER of CounterPunch after which your subscription expires, NOT the month. *Don't worry, this confuses everyone.*

Why You Shouldn't Buy a Van Heusen Shirt